CMI

RESEARCH STUDIES
OF THE
STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Volume XX Number 4
December, 1952

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE SUKSDORF FUNGUS COLLECTIONS, *Wm. Bridge Cooke and Charles Gardner Shaw* 135

KARL MARX AND THE FRENCH SECTIONS: CONFLICT IN THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL, *Henry Grosshans* 146

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHERS, *Bryson L. Jaynes* 164

The State College of Washington
Pullman, Washington

COMMONWEALTH MYCOLOGICAL INSTITUTE
20 MAY 1953

RESEARCH STUDIES

of the

STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

EDITOR

PAUL BECKETT*
Associate Professor of Public Administration

ACTING EDITOR

HOWARD C. PAYNE
Assistant Professor of History

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WALLIS BEASLEY
Associate Professor of Sociology

CHARLES D. CAMPBELL
Professor of Geology

FRED A. DUDLEY
Professor of English

ADOLPH HECHT
Associate Professor of Botany

Entered as second-class matter December 26, 1936, at the post office at Pullman, Washington, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Research Studies of the State College of Washington is published in Pullman, Washington, by the State College of Washington. It is issued four times a year—in March, June, September, and December.

PURPOSE. *Research Studies* is a medium of publication for articles of research in the pure sciences and arts. Its pages are open to the faculty and advanced students of the State College of Washington. One issue each year is devoted to papers read by members of the Pacific Sociological Society at its annual convention. Suitable articles by other persons are accepted whenever space is available.

MANUSCRIPTS. Submit manuscripts to Howard C. Payne, Room 429, Todd Hall, Pullman, Washington. Though no strict limit is set as to the maximum number of pages or the nature or number of illustrations, authors are reminded that the papers must be actual research, and that conciseness is desirable. Authors who will assume the expense may arrange for the inclusion of extra pages, tables, or illustrations.

SUBSCRIPTIONS. *Research Studies* will be mailed postpaid to subscribers for three dollars a year. Subscriptions are payable in advance to *Research Studies,* the State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.

EXCHANGE. *Research Studies* is offered in exchange to other colleges, universities, learned societies, and libraries. Publications sent in return should be addressed to the Exchange Department, Library, the State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A. At present, all back numbers and title pages can still be supplied.

SINGLE NUMBERS. Single numbers will be sold or exchanged as long as available; orders should be addressed to *Research Studies,* the State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A. For prices of back numbers (with the list of articles of each number), see pages 63-64 of the March, 1951, issue (Vol. XIX, No. 1). The price of the present number is ninety cents.

* On leave, 1951-53.

RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Volume XX December, 1952 Number 4

THE SUKSDORF FUNGUS COLLECTIONS[1]

WM. BRIDGE COOKE[2] and CHARLES GARDNER SHAW[3]

INTRODUCTION

Wilhelm N. Suksdorf was a botanist who lived in or near Bingen, Klickitat County, Washington for fifty-six years. He settled there in 1876, after having attended Iowa College (now Grinnell College) and the University of California at Berkeley. He realized early that the flora of Washington was poorly known and devoted most of his life to an intensive study of the native flora of South Central Washington.

Suksdorf's favorite collecting areas were Bingen, Falcon Valley near Bingen, and nearby regions of Klickitat County, such as the Klickitat and White Salmon Rivers. He also collected in areas of Skamania and Yakima Counties which had not been explored previously. Such places as Ice Cave, the Chiquash Mountains, Schmetterling See or Butterfly Lake, and so forth, were named by Suksdorf or by his Indian friends. Most of his names for places cannot be found on maps of the region. In southwestern Yakima County and adjacent Klickitat and Skamania Counties, Suksdorf had a fine collecting area upon his beloved Mt. Paddo, now known as Mount Adams, second highest mountain in the Washington Cascades. Here his favorite collecting location was Wodanthal, Valley of the Gods. He collected in it extensively before sheep were permitted to overgraze the area, denude the meadows, and leave the valley open to the rapid erosion characteristic in areas of volcanism and glaciation.

[1] Scientific Paper No. 1165, Washington Agricultural Experiment Station, Pullman. Project No. 1047. This investigation was supported in part by funds provided for biological and medical research by the State of Washington Initiative Measure No. 171.

[2] Formerly Research Associate in Plant Pathology, Department of Plant Pathology, State College of Washington. Now, Mycologist, Bacteriology Division, Environmental Health Center, Cincinnati, Ohio.

[3] Associate Professor and Associate Plant Pathologist, Department of Plant Pathology, State College of Washington.

As a result of overgrazing and the subsequent erosion this area is now a canyon known as Hell Roaring Canyon.

On the southern slopes of Mt. Adams in the Gifford S. Pinchot National Forest there are now five Forest Service Public Camp sites. From these camp sites one can easily revisit the areas in which Suksdorf collected the majority of the fungi mentioned in this paper.

At his death in 1932, Suksdorf willed his herbarium to the State College of Washington. Weber (1944) has studied Suksdorf's collections of higher plants and prepared an interesting biography, a log book, a gazetteer, a bibliography, and a list of phanerogamic type specimens. Reference should be made to Weber's paper for further details of Suksdorf's life.

The fungi in Suksdorf's herbarium were not curated until recently. These specimen's had been segregated from the higher plants, packaged, and stored separately. Labels had been prepared by Suksdorf for a few specimens, but in most cases, the habit, habitat, and other collection data were in German script. The locations were indicated by Suksdorf's special symbols. Packeting the specimens and transcribing the data were performed by the senior author. Assistance in transcribing Suksdorf's symbols was furnished by Mrs. E. F. Gaines and Dr. M. Ownbey. This collection is now part of the Mycological Herbarium of the Department of Plant Pathology, State College of Washington.

While there are about 30,000 sheets of flowering plants in the Suksdorf Herbarium, there are only about 1500 collections of fungi. A few of these collections were received in exchange from such collectors as Ellis, Burt, and Durand; but Suksdorf discouraged the exchange of mycological specimens. He preferred to collect for others and usually retained only a small portion of each collection for himself. In some cases, particularly where the collection was made about the time his correspondence ceased or in anticipation of correspondence which was never completed, large sets of duplicates are still among his collections.

The date of his first fungus collection is May 29, 1882; that of the last is September 23, 1927. He collected fungi most intensively in 1894 and 1902. Possibly this was because of the incessant urging by Holway that he get as many rusts and smuts as possible, and later by Burt, that he enlarge the knowledge of North American Thelephoraceae by collecting in the Northwest. While the Suksdorf-Burt correspondence lasted only a year (1902-1903), several hundred

specimens were involved, including specimens Burt considered new species and varieties as well as new records for North America.

In the spring of 1883, his first mycological collections were sent to Ellis, who received them enthusiastically. Ellis had sent Suksdorf a postcard dated August 18, 1882, in response to Suksdorf's advertisement in the Botanical Gazette, offering sets of plants for sale. Ellis requested specimens of fungi for his exsiccatum, North American Fungi, then in its ninth century.

In 1884, E. W. D. Holway, a banker in Decorah, Iowa, contacted Suksdorf and requested rust collections. The correspondence between Suksdorf and Ellis and between Suksdorf and Holway is extensive. The last letter from Ellis is dated July 29, 1896; that from Holway was sent from Minneapolis November 28, 1905. Both are mere reports on specimens sent them. Earlier correspondence includes requests for more material, suggestions as to collecting methods, discussions of interesting species, corrected identifications, etc. In the Suksdorf correspondence files are also letters from Macbride concerning Myxomycetes, from Clinton listing smuts, from Lloyd discussing Gasteromycetes, and from Petrak requesting material of *Cirsium* which he was then monographing.

In sending out specimens Suksdorf used a series of reference numbers, which were assigned without much relation to chronology. Specimens not sent out were not numbered. His numbers for fungus collections reach 1172. A number of groups were never sent out; these included the polypores, boletes, agarics, Clavarias, and the larger fleshy Discomycetes.

Suksdorf's interest in the fungi seems to have been largely a business proposition. While his notes show that, had he been in contact with a good agaricologist, he could have produced an excellent collection of fleshy fungi, his most important contributions were in the groups for which Ellis and Holway, in particular, placed orders. They demanded collections which could be broken up into sixty units for their large distributions. Neither would pay for short sets and the standard price for usable material was fifty cents per number. Holway, on occasion, did pay for half sets when his interest was particularly aroused. Burt had a standard order for Thelephoraceous material. He paid ten cents for each new species or new record from the State of Washington. This increased Suksdorf's interest and intensified his collecting activity in that field. Sydow, in Germany, offered to pay forty cents for each collection which could be broken

down into forty sets. He acknowledged receipt of two interesting specimens without mention of their names or disposition. Apparently no other mycologists were involved in these transactions.

New Species Based on Suksdorf Collections

About seventy new species of fungi have been described from Suksdorf's collections. Most of these are scattered through numerous papers by Ellis, Holway, Burt, and others. Only one paper (Ellis & Everhart, 1884) has been found devoted exclusively to fungi collected by Suksdorf. In this, fifteen new species of fungi are described.

The following list of new species and type collections is based on specimens present in the Suksdorf collection at the State College of Washington and on specimens found in other herbaria. The fungi are listed alphabetically according to the binomials assigned to them by the original author(s). No attempt has been made to present complete lists of synonyms. If the binomial originally assigned to the species is not in current usage today, the synonym employed in the body of this paper is given.

Aecidium collinsiae Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 4. 1884.

Puccinia collinsiae (Ell. & Ev.) P. Henn., Hedw. 37: 269. 1898.

On *Collinsia parviflora.* Falcon Valley, Wash. June 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#63).

Aecidium roestelioides Ell. & Ev., Jour. Mycol. *1*: 93. 1885.

Puccinia interveniens [Peck] Bethel, Blasd. Univ. Calif. Pub. Bot. 7: 119. 1919.

On *Sidalcea* sp. Spokane Co., Wash. W. N. Suksdorf (#144).

Aecidium tonellae Diet. & Holw., Erythea *3*: 77. 1895.

Puccinia collinsiae (Ell. & Ev.) P. Henn., Hedw. 37: 269. 1898.

On *Tonella collinsioides.* Klickitat Co., Wash. 29 Apr. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#380).

Anthostomella brachystoma Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 5. 1884.

On *Tsuga mertensiana.* Mt. Adams, Wash. 16 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#113).

Belonium arabicolum Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 352. 1894.

On *Arabis furcata.* Mt. Adams, Wash. 12 July 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#347).

Bovistella dealbata Lloyd, Myc. Writ. *1*: 86, f. 52-54. Apr. 1902.
Bovista dealbata (Lloyd) Sacc. & D. Sacc., Syll. Fung. *17*: 234. 1905.
Near Rockford, Wash. 10 May 1889. W. N. Suksdorf (#618).

Cenangium tryblidioides Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *1897*: 136. 1897.
On *Salix* sp. about 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 18 Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#482).

Ceratostoma tinctum Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 5. 1884.
Rhynchostoma tinctum (Ell. & Ev.) Berl. et Vogl., Add. Syll. Fung.: 125. 1886.
On *Acer macrophyllum*. Steinbach, Bingen, Wash. 21 March 1884. W. N. Suksdorf (#129).

Cercospora cirsii Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 379. 1894.
On *Cirsium remotifolium*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 25 Aug. 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#291).

Ciboria juncigena Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 348. 1894.
Sclerotinia juncigena (Ell. & Ev.) Whetzel, Farlowia *2*: 432. 1946.
On *Juncus* sp. Falcon Valley, Wash. 31 May 1882. W. N. Suksdorf (#371).

Coleosporium arnicale Arth., N. Am. Fl. *7*: 94. 1907.
Coleosporium Madiae Cooke, Grev. *7*: 102. 1879.
On *Arnica chamissonis*[4]. Falcon Valley, Wash. 30 Oct. 1901. W. N. Suksdorf (#644).

Coleosporium occidentale Arth., N. Am. Fl. *7*: 94. 1907.
On *Senecio hydrophiloides*. Falcon Valley, Wash. 17 July 1900. W. N. Suksdorf (#586).

Comatricha suksdorfii Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 5. 1884.

---

[4] Jackson (1922) considered *C. arnicale* Arth. a synonym of *C. Madiae* Cooke; he also concluded that the host of Suksdorf's type collection of *C. arnicale* was "probably . . . . *Madia, Hemizonia, Hemizonella,* or some close relative" (p. 115). Study of our portion of the type collection of *C. arnicale* and comparison of the host with collections of *Arnica chamissonis* Less. made by Suksdorf in the same area convince us that the host of this type collection is *Arnica chamissonis*.

Stemonitis suksdorfii (Ell. & Ev.) Massee, Mono. Myxogasteres: 76. 1892.

On *Pinus albicaulis.* Mt. Adams, Wash. 18 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#46).

Coniophora corrugis Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *13*: 310. 1926.

Corticium corruge (Burt) Burt in sched. ex Rogers & Jackson, Farlowia 1: 276. 1943.

On *Pinus contorta* var. *latifolia.* Mt. Adams, Wash. 17 July 1902. W. N. Suksdorf (#732).

Coniophora flavomarginata Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *13*: 311. 1926.

Mycoacia himantia (Schw.) Miller & Boyle, Univ. Iowa St. Nat. Hist. 18: 44. 1943.

On *Quercus garryana.* West. Klickitat Co., Wash. W. N. Suksdorf (#888).

Corticium spretum Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *13*: 229. 1926.

On *Fraxinus oregona.* Bingen, Wash. W. N. Suksdorf (#962).

Excipula conglutinata Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 6. 1884.

Heteropatella conglutinata (Ell. & Ev.) Nannf., Morph. & Syst. Disco.: 296. 1932.

On *Valeriana sitchensis.* Mt. Adams, Wash. 17 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#40).

Glonium tryblidioides Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *10*: 76. 1883.

On old rails. Washington Ter. W. N. Suksdorf (#19 or #217).

Hendersonia cylindrocarpa Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 6. 1884.

Stagonospora cylindrocarpa (Ell. & Ev.) Sacc., Syll. Fung. *3*: 450. 1884.

On *Brodiaea howellii.* Bingen, Wash. Dec. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#109).

Hendersonia diplodioides Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 6. 1884.

On *Sambucus glauca.* Falcon Valley, Wash. 5 Nov. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#95).

Hypochnus cervinus Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *3*: 232. 1916.

On *Acer macrophyllum.* West. Klickitat Co., Wash. W. N. Suksdorf (#847).

Hypoderma tunicatum Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Hist. Phila. *1894*: 347. 1894.

On *Arctostaphylos nevadensis*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 12 July 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#268).

Hypsotheca calicioides (Fr.) Ell. & Ev., Jour. Myc. 1: 129. 1885. *Caliciopsis Ellisii* Sacc., Syll. Fung. 8: 833-834. 1889.

On *Populus trichocarpa*. Cabbage Mt., Wash. 8 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#22).

Lachnella rhizophila Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 348. 1894.

On *Rhus diversiloba*, Columbia River, West. Klickitat Co., Wash. Jan. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#306).

Lamproderma robustum Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 5. 1884.

On *Haplopappus bloomeri*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 16 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#47).

Lasiobelonium subflavidum Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *24*: 136. 1897.

On *Salix* sp. About 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 18 Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#489).

Lasiosphaeria stuppea Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 4. 1884.

On *Tsuga mertensiana*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 16 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#115).

Leptosphaeria hysterioides Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 4. 1884.

On *Xerophyllum tenax*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 19 Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#48).

Linospora brunellae Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 337. 1894.

On *Prunella vulgaris*. Bingen, Wash. 23 April 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#267).

Lophidium trifidum Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *24*: 129. 1897.

On *Salix* sp. About 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 18 Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#483).

Melanomma alpestre Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 328. 1894.

On *Arctostaphylos nevadensis*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 12 July 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#342).

Melanomma cupulata Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *24*: 128. 1897.
On *Salix* sp. About 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 18 Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#484).

Patellaria signata Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 4. 1884.
Blitrydium signatum (Ell. & Ev.) Sacc., Syll. Fung. 8: 807. 1889.
On *Tsuga mertensiana*. Mt. Adams, Wash. Sept. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#112).

Peniophora decorticans Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *12*: 344. 1925.
On *Quercus garryana*. Bingen, Wash. W. N. Suksdorf (#910).

Peridermium ornamentale Arth., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *28*: 665. 1901.
Pucciniastrum goeppertianum (Kühn) Kleb. Wirtsw. Rostp.: 391. 1904.
On *Abies lasiocarpa*. 6000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 4 Sept. 1900. W. N. Suksdorf (#588).

Phialea ampla Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *24*: 135-6. 1897.
Helotium amplum (Ell. & Ev.) Seaver, N. Amer. Cup Fungi (Inop.): 133. 1951.
On *Salix* sp. Mt. Adams, Wash. 17, 18 Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#493).

Phoma lupini Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 6. 1884.
On *Lupinus* sp. Falcon Valley, Wash. 24 July 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#32).

Phragmidium biloculare Diet. & Holw., in Dietel, Bot. Gaz. *19*: 305. 1894.
On *Potentilla gelida* (=*P. flabellifolia*). Chiquash Mts., Skamania Co., Wash. Aug. 1892. W. N. Suksdorf (#351).

Phyllosticta eriogoni W. B. Cooke in Cooke & Shaw, Mycologia 44 (6). 1952.
On *Eriogonum elatum*. Viala, near Bingen, Wash. 2 June 1926. W. N. Suksdorf (#1137).

Phyllosticta hosackiae W. B. Cooke in Cooke & Shaw, Mycologia 44(6). 1952.
On *Lotus douglasii*, Falcon Valley, Klickitat Co., Wash. 11 Sept. 1884. W. N. Suksdorf (#149).

Placosphaeria arctostaphyli Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 359. 1894.

On *Arctostaphylos nevadensis*. Mt. Adams, Wash. 12 July 1896. W. N. Suksdorf (#343).

Pleospora amplispora Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 4. 1884.

On *Lupinus* sp. Mt. Adams, Wash. 26 June 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#74).

Puccinia angelicae Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*: 3. 1884.

(Not *P. angelicae* Fckl. 1870.)

Puccinia ellisii de Toni, in Sacc., Syll. Fung. *7*: 651. 1888.

On *Angelica genuflexa*. Falcon Valley, Wash. Aug. 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#24).

Puccinia areolata Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Bot. Gaz. *19*: 304. 1894.

On *Caltha biflora*. Wollweise, Skamania Co., Wash. 7 Sept. 1898. W. N. Suksdorf (#318b).

Puccinia aspera Diet. & Holw., in Arth., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *29*:230. 1902.

(Not *P. aspera* Bon. 1869.)

Puccinia pazschkei Diet., Hedw. 30: 103. 1891.

On *Saxifraga mertensiana*. 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. 17 Aug. 1897. W. N. Suksdorf (#537).

Puccinia asperior Ell. & Ev., Bull. Washb. Col. Lab. Nat. Hist. *1*:3. 1884.

On *Leptotaenia dissecta* (=*Lomatium dissectum*). Washington Ter. June 1883. W. N. Suksdorf (#86).

Puccinia chelonis Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Hedw. *36*: 297. 1897.

On *Chelone nemorosa*. 4-5000 ft., Chiquash Mts., Skamania Co., Wash. 27 Aug. 1895. W. N. Suksdorf (#455).

Puccinia densa Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Hedw. *36*: 298. 1897.

Puccinia violae (Schum.) DC., Fl. Fr. *6*: 62. 1815.

On *Viola glabella*. Chiquash Mts., Skamania Co., Wash. 28 Aug. 1895. W. N. Suksdorf.

Puccinia dichelostemmae Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Erythea *3*: 78. 1895.

On *Dichelostemma congesta* (=*Brodiaea puchella*). Bingen, Wash. 25 Apr., 22, May 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (#389).

Puccinia nuda Ell. & Ev., Jour. Mycol. *3*: 57. 1887.
On *Arnica chamissonis*[5]. Falcon Valley, Wash. July 1885. W. N. Suksdorf (#200).

Puccinia subangulata Holway, N. Am. Ured. *1*: 25. 1905.
On *Brodiaea congesta* (=*B. puchella*). Bingen, Wash. 20 May 1904. W. N. Sukesdorf (#976).

Puccinia subcircinata Ell. & Ev., Jour Mycol. *3*: 56. 1887.
On *Senecio triangularis*. Mt. Adams, Wash. Aug. 1885. W. N. Suksdorf (#197).

Puccinia suksdorfii Ell. & Ev., Jour Mycol. *7*: 130. 1892.
On *Troximon glaucum* (=*Agoseris glaucus*). Washington. W. N. Suksdorf.

Ramularia castillejae Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 375-6. 1894.
On *Castilleja miniata*. Bingen, Wash. 10 Aug. 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (#288).

Ramularia synthridis W. B. Cooke in Cooke & Shaw, Mycologia 44 (6). 1952.
On *Synthris reniformis*. Dog Creek, Skamania Co., Wash. 2 Sept. 1926. W. N. Suksdorf (#1151).

Sebacina plumbea Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *2*: 765. 1915.
(Not *S. plumbea* Bres. & Torrend. 1913.)
Sebacina plumbescens Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *3*: 241. 1916.
On *Populus trichocarpa*. Bingen, Wash. 18 Nov. 1902. W. N. Suksdorf (#862).

Sphaerella subcongregata Ell. & Ev., Jour. Mycol. *2*: 101. 1886.
On *Erigeron salsuginosus* (=*E. peregrinus*). Mt. Adams, Wash. 10 Aug. 1885. W. N. Suksdorf (#234).

Stereum patelliforme Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *7*: 182-3. 1920.
On *Acer macrophyllum*. Bingen, Wash. 16 April 1902. W. N. Suksdorf (#713).

Stictis chrysopsis Ell. & Ev., Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. *1894*: 353. 1894.

---

[5] Jackson (1922) concluded that the host of the type collection of *P. nuda* "is probably not *Arnica*, but a species of *Madia, Hemizonia, Hemizonella*, or some close relative of these" (p. 114). Study of our portion of the type collection of *P. nuda* and comparison of the host with collections of *Arnica chamissonis* Less. made by Suksdorf in the same area convince us that the host of the type collection is *Arnica chamissonis*.

On *Ceanothus integerrimus*. Bingen, Wash. 28 June 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (‡509).

Stictis serpentaria Ell. & Ev., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *24*:469. 1897.
Stictis pachyspora (Rehm) Rehm in Rab., Krypt. Fl. 1 (3): 175. 1889.

On *Salix* sp. 7000 ft., Mt. Adams, Wash. Sept. 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (‡481).

Thelephora scissilis Burt, Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard. *1*: 204-5. 1914.

On the ground, Bingen, Wash. 17 Jan. 1902. W. N. Suksdorf (‡716).

Tilletia elymi Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Bot. Gaz. *19*: 304. 1894.

On *Elymus* sp. Peter's Prairie, west of Ice Cave, Skamania Co., Wash. 13 Aug. 1886. W. N. Suksdorf (‡336).

Trichopeziza coarctata Ell. & Ev., Amer. Nat. *31*: 427. 1897.

On *Vaccinium myrtilloides* (=*V. membranaceum*). Skamania Co., Wash. 19 July 1894. W. N. Suksdorf (‡507).

Tylostoma occidentale Lloyd, Myc. Writ. *2*: Tyl. 13. pl. 76, f.1-2. Feb. 1906.

On the ground. Washington. W. N. Suksdorf.

Uromyces probus Arth., Bull. Torr. Bot. Cl. *38*: 376. 1911.

On *Sisyrinchium grandiflorum* (=*S. douglasii*). Columbia River, Wash. July 1893. W. N. Suksdorf (‡339b).

Uromyces suksdorfii Diet. & Holw. in Dietel, Erythea *3*: 77. 1895.

On *Silene oregana*. West. Klickitat Co., Wash. 17 July 1894. W. N. Suksdorf. (‡385).

(To Be Continued in Volume XXI, No. 1)

KARL MARX AND THE FRENCH SECTIONS: CONFLICT IN THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

HENRY GROSSHANS
Head, Editorial Department, Office of Publication

In the summer of 1862, Henri Tolain, chaser in bronze, and Eugène Fribourg, decorative engraver, came to London. There, according to one commentator, "in an evil hour the Paris bronziers met the learned and unsmiling Karl Marx."[1] It was the opinion of many European conservatives that this meeting was responsible for the organization which became a monster plot against society; an organization spreading its doctrine everywhere, penetrating even to the limits of China and India, where anti-social beings were gathered into a body known as the "Fraternal Company of Heaven and Earth."[2]

Marx did not meet Tolain and Fribourg in 1862, and was never informed concerning the behavior of the "Fraternal Company of Heaven and Earth." But the International Working Men's Association, founded on September 28, 1864, and traceable to the activities of the two Frenchmen, was, for the saturnine Marx, the most important expression of his international aspirations. As his unfinished work, *Capital,* provided the economic theory for his followers, so his performance within the International set the pattern for his acolytes in future efforts at revolutionary organization. The short history of the First International was the primary example of Marxian theory translated into action. No source in the early history of what is called "the struggle for the proletarian party" is as rich in material for an understanding of Marxism; and, in relation to the Association itself, many of the distinctive aspects of Marxian political philosophy are found in the controversies between Marx and the French sections of the International.

The Association was inaugurated with statements of friendship and good will by both Marx and the French. Tolain announced that all members agreed as to the general principles prompting the September meeting,[3] while Marx unbent to Engels, admitting that

[1] O. Yorke (*pseud.* W. H. Dixon), *Secret History of "The International" Working Men's Association* (London: Strahan & Co., 1872), p. 27.

[2] Cf. O. Testut, *L'Internationale et la jacobinisme au ban de l'Europe* (Paris: E. Lachaud, 1872), p. 251.

[3] *Opinion Nationale,* October 2, 1864.

Tolain was "a real worker's candidate . . . a very nice fellow."[4] Within a short time, however, this ardor of companionship cooled; expressions of mutual understanding were succeeded by long flurries of vituperation and scurrility. As the International made its way in the late 'sixties, its progress was accompanied by a bewildering mass of heated disputation; disputation which, in spite of its confused and often acrimonious subtlety, illustrated clearly the tenets of Marxian political theory and organizational technique.

THE QUESTION OF POLITICAL THEORY

Any discussion of Marxism should begin with the character of its founder. Particularly is this so if an attempt is made to consider Marxism in relation to Marx and his contemporaries; only then is it possible to understand the animosity that surrounded the German revolutionary. Of his erudition and sincerity there can be no doubt; but he was, to put it as fairly as possible, woefully lacking in patience and human understanding. "It is difficult to imagine any normal person wishing to meet Marx for a third time," writes a modern historian,[5] and it was certainly true that Marx possessed more than the usual inclination to snarl at the world. Moreover, he appears to have felt an uncommon hatred of common opinions and the fact that a large number of other men might hold a certain belief was to him sufficient cause to doubt not only its validity, but aroused suspicion as to the motivation leading to its acceptance.

Nor was this attitude toward others hidden. With the notable exception of Friedrich Engels, Marx, at one time or another, quarreled noisily and vociferously with almost every other contemporary political thinker. As important, perhaps, as any of the legacies left to his disciples was his tendency to indulge in furious castigation of his opponents. To disagree with him was to run the risk of being characterized as one of the *"eckelhaftesten Kerle," "Jammermenschen," "Paradehelden," "Kammermanderinen,"* and Marx's writings abound in these obscure and grotesque titles of opprobrium.[6] He quarreled with other German radicals in London

[4] Letter of November 4, 1864, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Engels und Karl Marx, 1844 bis 1883* (Stuttgart: J. H. W. Dietz, 1913), III, 188.

[5] A. Gray, *The Socialist Tradition* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1947), p. vi.

[6] Cf. *Die Neue Rheinische Zeitung. Politisch-ökonomische Revue* (April, 1850) for an example of Marx in fine form.

(who spoke disparagingly of him as "Doctor Great Mogul"),[7] he quarreled with the British trade union leaders, and he quarreled with George Potter, the editor of the International's organ, the *Beehive*. Although he is not always a reliable source, it is difficult to dissent from Mazzini's description of Marx as "a man of domineering disposition, jealous of the influence of others, . . . having, I fear, more elements of anger (even if just) than of love in his nature."[8] To be serious in debate without becoming rancorous was a virtue Marx could not claim, and the heaping of vitriolic expressions of dislike upon those who differed with him was an obsession, not a mere habit.

But personality alone was not responsible for the differences plaguing the International. Marx was a social theorist with a well-developed social dogma. His attitude toward the International was influenced by this social ideology and by his belief in the requirements of revolutionary theory. Prompted by the logical deductions drawn from his study of history, he was convinced that any organization lacking the guidance of correct theory could only prove ineffectual in dealing with its problems. "Marx saw it to be his duty to educate the masses, and gradually and carefully, but firmly and surely lead them toward a definite goal."[9]

For Marx, the study of society was a science and there were certain principles of social and political development as clearly demonstrable as the laws of any physical science. Marx believed that he had discovered these social and political precepts and this claim was never doubted by his followers. When Hippolyte Lissagaray published his brilliantly written history of the Paris Commune in 1876, he did not hesitate to contend that Marx had "applied the method of Spinoza to social science."[10] Almost two decades later, G. V. Plekhanov failed to strain at the idea of placing Marx within the tradition of natural science itself: "Logically, the investigation of Marx begins precisely where the investigation of Darwin ends."[11]

---

[7] Cf. Gottfried Kinkel in *Der Hermann*, March 22, 1862.

[8] "The International. Addressed to the Working Classes," *Contemporary Review* (July, 1872). The article first appeared in Mazzini's *Roma del Popolo* in 1871.

[9] B. Nicolaievsky and O. Maenchen-Helfen, *Karl Marx. Man and Fighter* (Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott Company, 1936), p. 267.

[10] *Histoire de la Commune de 1871* (Paris: Librairie Marcel Rivière et Cie, 1947 ed.), p. 7.

[11] *In Defense of Materialism* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1947 ed.), p. 244.

Even Engels, in his speech at Marx's graveside, stressed this aspect of his collaborator's political philosophy: "Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human society."[12]

This doctrinal identification of social theory and science produced in Marx's political thinking a strong element of historical certitude. If Engels, writing in 1890, was correct in stating that the aim of the International "was to weld together into one huge army the whole militant working class of Europe and America,"[13] it was equally true that this large organization was to be the material expression of a well-defined theory. The concept of the class struggle as the basis of historical development, the materialistic interpretation of history, and the necessity of political and economic movements being united must all be accepted as prerequisites to an understanding of society in the past, present, and future. To attempt to build a revolutionary organization without acknowledging these theoretical principles was, for Marx, to insure the organization's failure.

That most members of the International did not accept Marx's view of history and society, and, therefore, his interpretation of the Association's purpose, was painfully evident from the early days of the organization. According to Tolain, any alliance between the English and French workers resulted from the need to unite against possible harmful effects of the Anglo-French Trade Agreement of 1860.[14] E. Spencer Beesly, who presided at the founding gathering of the Association, contended that it was "the gallant struggle of Poland against her Russian oppressors which provided the impetus for the International."[15] British trade union leaders, such as Howell and Cremer, undoubtedly regarded the International as primarily a means of preventing English employers from importing continental workers who could be used to destroy the budding union movement.

The most important opposition to Marx's theoretical leadership of the Association came from the French sections. Unfortunately for Marx, the most influential members of the French working

[12] *Sozialdemokrat,* March 22, 1883.

[13] Preface to 1890 German edition of *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* in K. Marx, *Selected Works,* ed. C. P. Dutt (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1942), II, 433.

[14] Cf. *Opinion Nationale,* October 17, 1861.

[15] "The International Working Men's Association," *Fortnightly Review* (November 1, 1870).

class were under the influence of Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Marx was forced to spend much of his time in the unsuccessful attempt to wean the French from this pernicious bias. Almost every argument of the French against Marx can be found in the ideas of Proudhon. The amazement of Tolain and Fribourg at discovering that Marx did not accept Proudhon as the leading revolutionary figure of the century was an indication of the difficulty confronting the German socialist.[16]

It is doubtful if Marx ever disagreed with anyone as deeply and as consistently as he did with Proudhon. Nor did anyone so succeed in arousing him to such heights of asperity. Proudhon's ideas violated his sense of historical confidence and always served to infuriate Marx. The sins of Proudhon against Marxian doctrine were almost endless. Whenever Marx wished to point out a particular error in the opinions of his contemporaries, Proudhon's writings were always at hand as ready examples: Proudhon did not understand the scientific approach to social problems, he did not comprehend the true meaning of association, he was opposed to the treating of political and economic aims as one inseparable unity, and he retained an idealistic interpretation of history.

And Proudhon was guilty of all this. He even seemed to be content in his guilt and showed no inclination to seek enlightenment. He did not understand, or, perhaps, did not wish to understand, the scientific approach to the study of history, and "never has any school played more tricks with the word science than that of Proudhon."[17] He did not even understand Hegel, and Marx's leading biographer assures us that, in his arguments, Proudhon "simply did not grasp what he [Marx] was driving at."[18] The statement, *"la Justice est le Dieu suprême, elle est le Dieu vivant,"*[19] seems designed to set Marx's teeth on edge, and certainly some sympathy must be felt for his reactions to a writer who, in the midst of a serious discussion of social problems, inserts the sentence; "I am now speaking at random." Not satisfied with ignorance, Proudhon

[16] Cf. E. Fribourg, *L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs* (Paris: Le Chevalier, 1871), p. 46.

[17] K. Marx, *Capital. A Critique of Political Economy* (New York: Random House, 1940), p. 79.

[18] F. Mehring, *Karl Marx. The Study of his Life* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1948 ed.), p. 117.

[19] *De la Justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise* (Paris: Garnier, 1868 ed.), I, 43.

went so far as to oppose the very principles Marx believed must be accepted; he even denied the beneficial qualities of association, "regarding association with positive hatred. He said of it that there was more bad than good in it; that it was by nature sterile, even harmful, because it was a fetter on the freedom of the workers; that it was pure dogma, unproductive and burdensome."[20]

Already in 1846, Marx had complained that "M. Proudhon mixed up ideas and men,"[21] and the Frenchman's reliance upon the validity of a simple, primitive, moral justice was an unpardonable offense against the scientific laws of society:

> What opinion should we have of a chemist, who, instead of studying the actual laws of the molecular changes in the composition and decomposition of matter, and on that foundation solving definite problems, claimed to regulate the composition and decomposition of matter by means of the "eternal ideas," of *"naturalité,"* and *"affinité?"* Do we know any more about "usury," when we say it contradicts *"justice éternelle," "équité éternelle," "mutualité éternelle,"* and other *"vérités éternelles . . . ."*[22]

In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (1848), Proudhon had been relegated to that collection of ineffectual "economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organizers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind."[23]

The effects of Proudhon's ideas were not, however, so easily disposed of. Marx's reliance upon scientific dogma aroused the entrenched suspicion of the French regarding German political thinking and its dependence upon a belief in what they thought of as a mechanical universe. They were shocked and annoyed by what they considered Marx's faith in a quasi-mechanical causality.[24] The possession of a scientific political theory was not an attribute to be praised and the French persisted in calling those studies bearing on human society "moral and political sciences," as distinct from

[20] F. Engels, Introduction to 1891 edition of *The Civil War in France*, in Marx, *Selected Works*, II, 456.

[21] Letter to P. V. Annenkov, December 28, 1846, *Selected Works*, I, 374.

[22] *Capital*, p. 97.

[23] Marx, *Selected Works*, I, 236.

[24] Cf. L. von Stein, *Der Socialismus und Communismus des Heutigen Frankreichs* (Leipzig: O. Wigand, 1842) for excellent background discussion of this French attitude.

"sciences" in the strict sense of the word. Jealously guarding their individuality, Frenchmen such as Tolain and Fribourg believed that Marx's scientific socialism aimed at the restriction of the area within which the free expression of vital and creative impulses could work. V. I. Lenin—and his interpretation should be good enough for most—saw that in Marxism "freedom is the realization of necessity,"[25] and, for the French, this angle of argument was too abstract and too clearly threatened their idealistic belief in individual liberty to be acceptable.

Suspicious of Marx's science, the French were no less reluctant to accept a specific political program for the International. Discouraged by their past experiences and obsessed by the belief that the working class could expect nothing of value from political activity, they argued that the Association should concern itself with what they called economic "reforms of structure." While Marx regarded any revolutionary activity as a political act, the French clung to a healthy scepticism regarding the advisability of a labor organization involving itself in political questions. In all this they were followers of Proudhon and

> they babble about science and know nothing. They scorn all revolutionary action, i.e., action arising out of the class struggle itself, all concentrated social movements, and therefore all those which can be carried through by political means . . . . Proudhon has done enormous mischief.[26]

This opposition to political activity was strengthened by the French hatred of centralization. Marx possessed an unshakeable belief in the superiority and indeed the historical necessity of centralization, whether economic or political. But the leading French members of the International were provincials in the best sense of the term. In place of centralization, they relied upon what became known as mutualism. Without a concrete political program, mutualism was the expressed belief in the possibility of the working class uniting free of constraint or authoritarian direction. Only this unrestrained freedom in unity made it possible for the individual workingman to "worship God without priests, work without a master, borrow without usury, have possessions without mortgages, formulate his feelings without prejudice, participate in the govern-

[25] Cf. Footnote in Marx, *Selected Works*, I, 19.

[26] Marx's letter of October 9, 1866, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann* (New York: International Publishers, 1934), p. 39.

ment of his country without being represented by heroes and rogues."[27] Mutualism was basically an individualistic social hypothesis, depending upon mutual economic aid between workers and the complete absence of any authority with power to influence or coerce others. Most glaring in its difference from Marxism was the mutualist denial of the industrial, collective unity of class. The Marxist belief that the working class must act as a unit and that it produces its ideas as a unit found barren reception with the French. Prepared to admit that all members of the working class had common problems, the French were not ready to accept the proposition that they must submit to a theory which seemed at variance with their individualistic inclinations.

In May, 1846, Proudhon had written to Marx: "We should not give mankind new work by creating new confusion. Let us rather give the world an example of wise and far-seeing toleration."[28] But tolerance was impossible when Marx and the French could not agree upon a common theoretical program for the International. If Marx looked upon the followers of Proudhon as those guilty of "*Bourgeoissozialismus*," the French regarded his attempt to superimpose a strict revolutionary theory upon the International as a disguised move to replace one type of tyranny with another. It was the Russian, Michael Bakunin, who summed up the charge against Marx and put it in its most significant form; but his statement was acceptable to the French:

> Marx, as a thinker, is upon the right road. He has established as a principle the fact that all political, religious, and legal developments in history are not basic concepts themselves, but only the consequences of economic developments. That is a powerful and fruitful idea . . . . But, on the other hand, Proudhon understood the concept of freedom much better than Marx. Proudhon, when not involved in matters of doctrine or metaphysics, had the true instinct of the revolutionary . . . . It is possible that Marx might develop a reasonable system of freedom, but the instinct for freedom fails him. He is, from the crown of his head to his toes, an advocate of authority.[29]

---

[27] Cf. Proudhon's prospectus for the journal *Peuple*, dated May, 1847, and quoted by É. Dolléans and J.-L. Puech, *Proudhon et la Révolution de 1848* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948), p. 13.

[28] Quoted by Mehring, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

[29] Speech at the Bâle Congress, September 6, 1869, quoted by F. Brupbacher, *Marx und Bakunin. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Internationalen Arbeiterassoziation* (Munich: n.p., 1920), p. 64.

THE GENERAL COUNCIL

The French refusal to accept Marx's theoretical interpretation of the Association was matched by the opposition to his methods of practical organization. Theoretical differences were mirrored in questions of practical politics and it was the place of the General Council within the International which provided the focus of the controversy between the French sections and Karl Marx.

Because he was an exile in London, there was no place for Marx as a member of any of the national organizations adhering to the Association. Only the formation of the General Council in the British capital allowed him to join the International. The first General Provisional Council of 1864, consisted of twenty-seven Englishmen, nine Frenchmen, six Italians, two Swiss, two Poles, and ten Germans, including Marx. Also in London were the designated organs of the Association, the *Workman's Advocate*, which became the *Commonwealth* in February, 1866, and George Potter's *Beehive*.

The position of the Council was not clearly defined in the Provisional Rules of the Association. Article three of the Rules stated that a General Council should be elected by the annual Congresses of the International, while article five gave the Council the right to convoke a General Congress "in cases of urgency." Article six dealt most fully with the Council and it was over the interpretation of this article that contention arose:

> The Central Council shall form an international agency between the different co-operating associations, so that the working men of one country be constantly informed of the movements of their class in another country; that an inquiry into the social state of the different countries of Europe be made simultaneously, and under a common direction; that the questions of general interest mooted in one society be ventilated by all; and that when immediate practical steps should be needed, as, for instance, in cases of international quarrels, the action of the associated societies be simultaneous and uniform.[80]

In spite of the turgid and distended language of the Rules, Marx's conception of the Council's place was clear and uncompromising. The Council was the dispenser of correct theory together with that "spirit of generalization" which the individual sections lacked: "It is only the General Council which can supply this deficiency, which can thus accelerate the truly revolutionary move-

[80] K. Marx, *Selected Works*, II, 443-44.

ment."[31] The General Council was the official head of the Association. As such, it was responsible for the authoritative statements of the Association's purposes and activities. Those who disagreed with the Council were those opposed to the progress of the organization and Marx, with unabashed sincerity, could state in 1871, that, from the beginning, "the history of the International was a continuous struggle on the part of the General Council against the sects and amateur experiments opposed to the true movement of the working class."[32]

This interpretation of the Council's position was an easy deduction from Marx's general political theory. In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* Marx had written: "The proletariat will use all its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class."[33] How could the proletariat be organized as a ruling class save through the application of correct revolutionary theory? And who was better qualified to see that the proletariat, organized in the International, satisfied the demands of this theory than Marx? The Council, guided and sustained by Marxian direction, was more than a mere correspondence center for the various national groups. It was the repository of officialdom within the Association and the arbiter of national disputes.

Such an interpretation did not receive the allegiance of the most important sections of the International. The British trade union leaders, all models of the English labor official with a pragmatic turn of mind, could not be counted upon for support. Already in 1865, George Howell found that the Council was being disturbed "by the introduction of the religious ideas by a German doctor named Karl Marx," and by "that wildest of all wild political dreams—a *République universelle, sociale et démocratique.*"[34] Whatever the reasons for Howell's disapproval of Marx's actions, the British members did not play important parts in the controversy over the place of the Council within the International. The Reform Bill of

[31] Marx's letter of March 28, 1870, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann,* p. 107.

[32] Letter to A. Bolte, November 23, 1871, *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becher, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. an F. A. Sorge und Andere* (Stuttgart: J. H. W. Dietz, 1906), pp. 38-39.

[33] K. Marx, *Selected Works,* I, 227.

[34] "The History of the International Association," *The Nineteenth Century* (April, 1878).

1867 opened new horizons for the British unionists and it was, perhaps, inevitable that their interest in the Association should lapse. They remained titular members of the International, but energy in this direction flagged during the late 'sixties, and in 1871, after the Paris Commune, only one British trade union remained affiliated with the organization.

As in matters of political theory, so in questions of the Council, the French provided the chief opposition to Marx's ideas. From the first, the French members were unsympathetic toward Marx's views. When they spoke of the *"Conseil général,"* they did not mean the "General Council," as Marx thought of that term. While Marx looked upon the Council as the directing force within the International, Fribourg was certain that it was only a means of communication between the various branches of the "republican and federative" Association, and most assuredly was not the executor of the International's policy.[85]

The first important crisis over this question of the Council came barely six months after the Association's inception. Félix Lelubez, a French refugee who had come to London following Louis Napoleon's *coup d'État,* and who was regarded by Marx as "a very good intermediary between the French and English workers,"[86] assumed to himself the duty of turning the International into an outspoken revolutionary opponent of the Second Empire. The Paris members were not slow to take issue with this attitude. On February 10, 1865, Henri Tolain addressed a letter to Lelubez protesting against the attacks made upon him for not adopting this ultra-revolutionary position.[87] Fearing that this protest would not be sufficient, Tolain, accompanied by Fribourg, came to London in March. There he spoke out against the claims of the Council to precedence over the national sections and argued that the Association was *"une société d'étude, non une nouvelle charbonnerie."*[88] Angered at this opposition of Tolain and Fribourg, Lelubez announced on April 4, that he was withdrawing from the General Council because "he had no confidence in the persons who represent the Association

[85] *Op. cit.,* p. 20.

[86] Cf. letter to Engels, November 4, 1864, *Briefwechsel,* III, 188.

[87] Quoted by J. Tchernoff, *Histoire politique contemporaine. Le parti républicain au coup d'état et sous le second empire* (Paris: A. Pedone, 1906), pp. 455-56.

[88] Cf. Fribourg, *op. cit.,* p. 24.

in Paris."[39] Although Lelubez reconsidered and returned to the Council in July, 1865, the breach between the French sections in Paris and the Council had been opened.

The initial General Conference of the International was held in London in late September, 1865. Tolain, Fribourg, and Eugène Varlin, who was to become Marx's principal French antagonist, were among those who made the journey from Paris as delegates. After receiving a report of the International's progress, the Conference began a discussion of future plans for the organization. It was evident at once that the French attitude toward certain important questions would place a strain upon the Association.

Indifferent to Marx's sensibilities concerning the need of authoritative statements of the Association's position, the French had taken it upon themselves to decide the interpretation of the International's official documents. In the Provisional Rules, adopted in 1864, occurred the phrase; "That the economical emancipation of the working class is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means."[40] To Marx's chagrin, the Paris sections, in publishing the Rules in France, omitted the last three words of the sentence and thus further satisfied their own anti-political inclinations. Nor did they take kindly to any attempt to chastise them on this account. Led by Fribourg, they argued that they had the right to publish the proceedings of any Congress or of any other decision of the Association, and that their interpretation of such documents was as valid as that of any other part of the International.[41] The fact that the French text differed at several points from the English and German was, perhaps, not too important; but of major importance, from Marx's view, was the question of whether or not there was within the organization one group responsible for the opinions expressed in the name of the International. The French were, however, adamant on this subject and in 1870, Marx was still complaining that they had changed the Council's proclamations, having substituted "equal rights and duties" for "the concrete demand for the abolition of class rule."[42]

The questions of official organizational pronouncements were not the only matters of contention at the London Conference. In a

[39] Cf. *Beehive,* April 8, 1865.
[40] Marx, *Selected Works,* II, 442.
[41] Cf. Fribourg, *op. cit.,* p. 51.
[42] Letter of March 28, 1870, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann,* p. 107.

discussion of plans for the next annual Congress, the French proposed that all members of the International be allowed to attend and vote and that the practice of designated delegates be abandoned. As the 1866 Congress was to be held in Geneva, the number of French members able to attend would have insured a majority for them on any matter brought before the annual meeting. The British delegates joined the German in defeating this move designed to do away with the accepted procedure of delegate apportionment. The French also opposed a motion condemning the Russian oppression of Poland, arguing that this was a matter of no concern to an organization interested only in economic questions. Again, the decision of the British to support the motion was instrumental in overriding the French objections.

The differences, so evident at London, dominated the Geneva Congress of 1866. French hostility to the General Council had crystallized and much of this hostility seemed to be directed at Marx. Angered at what one Paris correspondent called the attempt of the members of the Council "to group all the laboring forces of Europe behind a single design of their own,"[43] the French made an effort to confine membership in the Association to manual workers and free the International of the *"partie d'économistes, de journalistes, d'avocats."*[44] The Provisional Rules of 1864 stated that the Council should "consist of working men belonging to the different countries represented in the International."[45] The French were prepared to insist upon the literal enforcement of this article and only the opposition of the English and German sections kept the Geneva Congress from becoming a triumph for those who "had their heads full of the emptiest Proudhonist phrases."[46]

Much of the French suspicion of the Council resulted from the authoritarian composition of the Council itself. Article five of the Rules extended to the Council "power to add to the number of its members."[47] Marx took full advantage of this privilege and succeeded in creating a Council consisting of men prepared to accept his interpretation of the International. On the original Council there

---

[43] Cf. *Presse,* September 13, 1866.

[44] Cf. L. Reybaud, "L'Économie politique des ouvriers," *Revue des Deux Mondes* (November 1, 1866) for excellent resumé of this attitude.

[45] Marx, *Selected Works,* II, 443.

[46] Marx's letter of October 9, 1866, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann,* p. 39.

[47] Marx, *Selected Works,* II, 444.

had been political exiles such as Eccarius, Lessner, Pfänder, and Lochner; all men prepared to accept Marx's leadership. Marx labored diligently to increase his influence in the Council and, by 1871, had succeeded in placing his supporters in the positions as corresponding secretaries for the various national groups. With Eccarius representing the United States, Engels the secretary for Belgium and Spain, and Marx acting as the Council delegate for Germany and Holland, the General Council had taken on the appearance of a family circle with Marx as the undisputed patriarch.[48]

In the late eighteen sixties, it was Eugène Varlin who led the French opposition to Marx and the Council. Varlin was one of those effulgent Frenchmen, brilliant and colorful, who made France the most attractive of all Western countries in the nineteenth century. Lacking those qualities of buffoonery making it difficult to take Michael Bakunin seriously, Varlin was no advocate of an incoherent social philosophy, but possessed a seriousness of purpose and all the attributes of aggressive leadership.

Varlin began to play an important part in the activities of the International in 1868. In articles written for Henri Rochefort's *Marseillaise* and the Paris *Travail,* he demanded that the trend in the direction of centralized control be reversed and the Council restrained from interfering with the national branches. He advocated a weakening of the Council and the reconstruction of the Association along the lines of Proudhon's concept of "all associated and all free." The Council's proposals at the Bâle Congress of 1869, that its executive powers be increased and that it be given the authority to suspend any section of the International, confirmed Varlin's fears. He was now convinced that the true course of the Association, *"la tendance fédéraliste et antiétatiste,"* was being threatened by Marx and his followers.[49]

In response to this danger, Varlin planned a reorganization of the International. He hoped to unite at least the French members in support of a federalist program which would leave each small group of workers free to act upon its own initiative, while all would draw upon a common pride in their position and a mutual respect for each other's actions. In place of a General Council dominated

[48] The unpaged "Manuscript Minute Book of the First International Working Men's Association" in the Bishopsgate Institute in London contains numerous complaints by the French at this aspect of the Council.

[49] Cf. *Commerce,* September 19, 1869.

by *"artistes, savants, et gens de lettres,"* a Council far removed from the actual events of the worker's life, there would be a collection of small councils, each independent, yet joined to one another through bonds of common interest and affection.

Varlin organized the Federal Chamber of Workers' Societies in December, 1869. The Chamber occupied the same building in Paris as the Paris sections of the International, but was outside their jurisdiction. Membership in the Chamber was confined to workingmen alone and it was not a competitor of the Council, but the beginning of a process making the Council superfluous. As Marx regarded Varlin as a ragamuffin and a bully,[50] so the Frenchmen looked with antipathy upon the whole idea of an organization controlled from a central council with power to deliver pronouncements upon the actions of the individual branches. So successful was Varlin at withstanding Marx's influence within the Association that on March 23, 1871, when the Paris Federal Council of the International extended support to the Paris Commune, its "Manifesto" advocated communal autonomy and subordinated the political question to that of the "organization of credit, exchange, and co-operation in order that the worker may be assured the entire value of his labor."[51]

By the early 'seventies, it was apparent that the General Council had become separated from the national organizations. The Bâle Congress of 1869 had shown, as the Congress at The Hague in 1872 was to show, that only by the most flagrant jerrymandering and by the promotion of second-rate men could Marx maintain his claim to the titular leadership of the Association. The actions of the national groups, and this was particularly true of the Paris sections, had little connection with those of the Council. While Marxian theory triumphed in the latter, the columns of the *Marseillaise* featured Raoul Rigault's defense of the Hébertist tradition, Gambon's campaign for the refusal to pay taxes, and Jules Vallès' exposition of an only partially digested Proudhonism. To compare the Council with the Paris section was to compare a drab uniformity with a kalaedoscopic presentation of brilliance and contradiction. Marx succeeded in making the Council what he wished: His failure to do the same with

[50] Cf. letter of December 5, 1868, *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann*, p. 99.

[51] This announcement of support for the Commune appeared first in the form of a flysheet to be found in *Les Murailles politiques françaises depuis le 18 juillet 1870 jusqu'au mai 1871* (Paris: n.p., 1871), II, 52-53.

the rest of the International was hidden by the hapless events of March 18, 1871, and after.

The defeat of the Paris Commune and the death of Varlin at Montmarte on May 28, 1871, sapped the strength of the organized French opposition to Marx. That autumn, at the London Conference of the Association, Marx ruthlessly exploited this advantage. The personnel at the Conference was carefully sifted. Out of twenty-three delegates, thirteen were representatives of the Council. Marx was finally able to secure a majority for a resolution declaring that "in the militant state of the working class, its economic movement and its political action are indissolvably united." Also, under his direction, the Conference passed resolutions "consolidating" the International, advocating centralism as an organizational method, and strengthening the position of the Council. In Marx's view, the struggle with the French Proudhonists had ended: "At last, by means of Conference Resolutions I (2) and (3), IX, XVI, and XVII, it [the Council] delivered its long prepared blow."[52]

Soon after the Conference, the *Sonvillier Circular* was posted throughout Europe. Six years after Tolain and Fribourg had carried their quarrel with the Council to London, opposition to centralization in the International dealt a mortal blow to an organization already crippled by the loss of the strongest part of the French working class. The question posed was still the same: What was the position of the General Council?

> At the creation of the International Working Men's Association, there was instituted a General Council, which was, . . . to serve as a central bureau of correspondence between the sections; but absolute authority was not conferred upon it, ... We demand the maintenance of the principle of the autonomy of the sections, ... We demand that the General Council . . . return to its proper role which is that of a simple bureau of correspondence and statistics; that unity which it now wishes to establish by centralization and dictation, we wish to realize by the free federation of autonomous groups.[53]

By this date, however, the International had lost all cohesion it might at one time have possessed. The French government used the new demands for order to root out the remains of the Association in that country; what elements of the organization survived the

[52] Marx's letter to Bolte, *supra.*

[53] J. Guillaume, *L'Internationale. Documents et Souvenirs.* (Paris: P.-V. Stock, 1905-10), II, 232ff.

Commune fell prey to Thiers and his friends.[54] The English trade unions had severed connections with the International and the Council consisted of a rather sorry group of nonentities, Hales, Rochat, Rottershead, Cohn; the faithful Engels; and a handful of exiled Communards. Weakened by the events of 1871, and by fratricidal conflict, the International floundered. In 1872, the Council was transferred to the United States, while the organization slowly drifted into obscurity.

CONCLUSION

The involved struggle between Karl Marx and the French sections of the International has been forgotten. But the implications of the controversy had important effects upon the radical tradition in the West. If the advocates of Marxism were to adopt the belief that an international organization of the working class must defend itself by "ever centralizing its forces still more strongly,"[55] the non-Marxist radicals were left to ponder the conundrum posed by Mazzini:

> Any nucleus of individuals which assumes to itself the direct government or rule of a vast multitude of men, belonging to different countries, diverse in tendency, political condition, economic interests, and modes of activity, must always end either by acting tyrannically, or by not acting at all.[56]

Marx's belief that any organization must have an authoritarian center capable of guiding the members in the road of right dogma became the underlying premise of Marxian international theory. From his claims on behalf of the Council, it was one short step to V. I. Lenin's arguments in support of a "socialist vanguard." Revolutionary centralism, or what Proudhon would have called "a plebian Hercules," was a necessity if the international proletariat were to avoid defeat. This was the lesson drawn by the Marxists from the history of the First International. "The International was founded in order to replace the socialist or semi-socialist sects by a real organization of the working class for struggle."[57]

---

[54] Cf. G. Bourbin, "La lutte du Gouvernement français contre la Première Internationale," *International Review for Social History* (Leiden, 1939), pp. 86ff.

[55] Mehring, *op. cit.*, p. 481.

[56] *Op. cit.*

[57] Marx's letter to Bolte, *supra.*

This interpretation resulted in a break in the history of Western radicalism: it substituted revolutionary tactics for revolutionary idealism and it lent an authoritarian cast to what had been a latitudinal, free-thinking tradition. The multifarious experience of men was surrendered in favor of doctrinal determinism: to speak *ex cathedra,* as it were, became the same as to speak scientifically, and opposition to dogma became heresy. French radicalism had been personalized ("Whoever lays hands on me to govern me is a usurper and a tyrant, and I declare him my enemy") and idealistic (*"la liberté, toujours la liberté, rien que la liberté"*). Marxian internationalism was oracular and categorical; in the last analysis, narrow and restricted, lacking depth and sensitivity. No matter how Marx and his followers might protest, the French had been correct; the "instinct for freedom" failed them. Any alliance required acceptance of a "scientific," dogmatic view and there was no place for any alternate opinion. Unfortunately, the full implications of this theory are still to be experienced.

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD TEACHERS[1]

BRYSON L. JAYNES
Assistant Professor of English

THE PROBLEM

Accurate information concerning the attitudes of the people toward their schools is a need of those whose responsibility it is to operate the schools. The Washington Public Opinion Laboratory undertook a poll in October, 1948, to determine the attitudes of the residents of the state toward several features of the public schools of the state.

The data of the poll were obtained through a state-wide, area-probability sample design in which 515 persons were interviewed by trained field interviewers of the Laboratory. The data thus collected were then made available in the Laboratory for analysis and study.

The present study takes up questions dealing with the most important characteristics of teachers, salaries, certain personal practices of teachers, and employment of married women as teachers. The study investigates not only the attitudes expressed by the people on those questions but also the extent to which those attitudes are affected by the socio-economic factors of age, parentage of school age children, size of community, income, marital status, educational experience, occupation, region of birth, foreign or American birth, kinship with teachers, and friendship with teachers.

The questions considered in this study appeared in the schedule as follows:

22. What do you feel are the three most important characteristics of a good teacher?
23. (Space reserved for second choices.)
24. (Space reserved for third choices.)
25. In general, do you think that the teachers in your local public schools are paid: too much, about right, too little, don't know?

[1] Based on a dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ed. D. degree, State College of Washington (1951).

26. What do you think would be a fair yearly salary for a good public school teacher who has had ten years' experience in teaching?

27. If you were a member of a school board would you employ a woman teacher who: smoked moderately, drank moderately, went to dances, engaged in political activity?

28. If you were a member of a school board would you employ a male teacher who: smoked moderately, drank moderately, went to dances, engaged in political activity?

29. Do you feel that married women should be employed as teachers in public schools in normal times?

Method

The questions were so arranged on the schedule that the responses could be readily coded for punching into cards prepared for sorting by the International Business Machines card sorter. All of the responses made to the first three questions above were grouped into ten categories. The IBM cards were then sorted into ten groups on the punch for question 22; the space for this punch was reserved for first choices as mentioned by the respondent. Each group of cards was then separated according to ten of the socio-economic factors listed above. (Region of birth within the United States was omitted.) Each of these ten sortings gave a cross-tabulation of frequencies of first choices of important characteristics as made by the different socio-economic groups.

The cards were then re-sorted on the punch for question 23; the space for this punch was reserved for second choices. The ten categories thus obtained were sorted according to the socio-economic factors. The same procedure was followed for third choices. In question 25 there are four categories. Each of these was sorted according to the eleven socio-economic factors. A similar procedure was followed for questions 26, 27, 28, and 29. This repeated sorting resulted in eighty-five cross-tabulations of the frequency of attitudes as expressed by the various socio-economic groups.

Chi-square values were then computed for each of the 85 cross-tabulations. Chi-square is a method of testing the significance of a difference between frequencies, a method that is particularly applicable to tabulations such as are used in the present study. If one assumes that the sample is random and that two or more populations are identical in opinion on a given factor, chi-square shows how often observed differences might occur by chance alone.

The significance of a particular value of chi-square appears, however, most readily when used in conjunction with degrees of freedom. The use of chi-square values and degrees of freedom made possible the reading of probability values from a table abridged from Fisher.[2]

A *P* value of .05 means that if the poll were repeated 100 times, chance alone would have caused the result which is being examined only 5 times, while other factors would give as great or greater deviation 95 times. The 5 per cent confidence level, therefore, indicates that chance alone could have caused the observed result not more than 1 time in 20. It is assumed, then, that the present observation is the result of real factors and not of chance. A *P* value of .03, .02, and .01 means that the observed result could have been obtained by chance only 3, 2, and 1 times in 100 trials; a *P* value of .001 means that the observed result could have been obtained by chance only 1 time in 1,000.

For most purposes, investigators agree that a *P* value larger than .05 does not give reliable evidence of the absence of chance influence.[3] The present study adheres to this principle. Table 1 lists the probability values resulting from 85 cross-tabulations of the relationships studied. Sixty-five of the relationships gave probability values so large that they could not be considered significant. The 20 significant figures are underlined.

---

[2] John Gray Peatman, *Descriptive and Sampling Statistics* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 515.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 364, "Many investigators take a P value of .05 as the limiting confidence criterion in evaluating the likelihood of a sample result for a hypothesis."

TABLE 1
PROBABILITY VALUES OF CHANCE FROM CROSS-TABULATIONS

Socio-economic factors	Questions							
	Important characteristic			Adequacy of pay	Amount of salary	Personal practices Women	Personal practices Men	Married women
	First choices	Second choices	Third choices					
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Age	.43	.45	.12	.02	.001	.001	.173	.97
Parent—non-parent	.22	.63	.25	.30	.08	.10	.64	.34
Community size	.55	.03	.52	.10	.06	.001	.02	.94
Income	.03	.70	.97	.03	.001	.001	.15	.38
Marital status	.001	.19	.62	.05	.02	.06	.20	.77
Education	.40	.14	.54	.01	.01	.001	.001	.005
Occupation	.32	.08	.75	.11	.01	.13	.013	.63
Region of birth	x	x	x	.35	.17	.065	.10	.77
Foreign—American birth	.42	.85	.63	.30	.10	.15	.34	.35
Kinship	.07	.53	.20	.07	.75	.98	.93	.21
Friendship	.08	.93	.18	.20	.40	.90	.97	.85

Significant Differences

The twenty relationships which produced statistical evidence of significant differences of opinion on the eight questions are: the most important characteristics of a good teacher distributed by community size, income, and marital status; adequacy of teachers' pay distributed by age, income, marital status, and educational experience; amount of teachers' salaries by age, income, marital status, educational experience, and occupation; personal practices of women teachers distributed by age, community size, income, and educational experience; personal practices of men teachers distributed by community size, educational experience, and occupation; employment of married women as teachers distributed by educational experience. These twenty distributions are analyzed on the following pages.

Distribution of opinion on the eight questions by region of birth, foreign or American birth, kinship with teachers, and friendship with teachers showed no significant differences.

Analysis of Data

Important Characteristics

The spaces on the schedule and on the IBM punch cards for questions 22, 23, and 24 were devoted to first, second, and third choices of the most important characteristics of a good teacher. In the original coding of the schedules, the responses were grouped into 32 categories. For the purpose of tabulation and calculation, these 32 were grouped under 10 headings as follows:

1. Self-sublimation
   - Understanding
   - Tolerance
   - Patience
   - Affection
   - Cooperation
   - Loyalty
2. Self-control
   - Temperament
   - Humor
   - Well-balanced
   - Frankness
3. Self-direction
   - Ambition
   - Intelligence
   - Business acumen
   - Experience
4. Culture pattern
   - Morals
   - Modesty
   - Manners
   - Honor
   - Conscientiousness
   - Freedom from political ties
   - Religious standing
5. Training
   - Teaching methods
   - Knowledge of subject
6. Techniques
   - Good speech
   - Discipline
7. Physiological characteristics
   - Health
   - Appearance
   - Age
   - Married
8. Personality
   - Personality
   - Character
   - Leadership
9. Others
10. Don't know

Table 2 shows the distribution of the three choices of the most important characteristics of a good teacher.

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF THREE CHOICES

Characteristic	First Choices		Second Choices		Third Choices	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Self-sublimation	201	39.03	177	34.4	136	26.4
2. Self-control	17	3.3	13	2.5	21	4.0
3. Self-direction	18	3.5	28	5.4	34	6.6
4. Culture Pattern	39	7.5	41	7.9	50	9.7
5. Training	78	15.1	99	19.2	83	16.1
6. Techniques	28	5.4	26	5.0	16	3.4
7. Physiological characteristics	21	4.0	29	5.6	30	5.8
8. Personality	84	16.3	55	10.7	46	8.9
9. Other	5	1.0	4	.8	3	.6
10. Don't know	14	2.7	31	6.0	70	13.6
11. Reject	10	2.0	12	2.3	26	5.0
Total	515	99.83	515	99.8	515	100.1

These attitudes on the part of the people should be a specific indication to teacher candidates and to teacher training institutions. If the candidates do not have or are not willing to develop qualities listed by a large proportion of the people among their first three choices, they would do well to consider some other profession. Teacher training institutions, likewise, would find their graduates meeting with greater favor if they selected candidates and made provision in their programs for the development of those qualities chosen by the people.

An inspection of the columns headed 22, 23, and 24 in Table 1 will reveal that, on the basis of a P value of .05 or less, income and marital status show greater than chance deviations from normal distribution for first choices, community size for second choices, and none for third choices.

The income group under $2,000 showed more than twice chance frequency in choosing adherence to the culture pattern. The choices of the middle income people ($2,000 to $4,000) were in definite contrast with the low income group. The middle group chose culture

pattern only about half as frequently as chance would have indicated. The high income group (over $4,000) chose the qualities listed under self-control and self-direction nearly one and one-half times as frequently as chance. It is definite that people of different incomes have different ideas of the important characteristics of a good teacher.

Marital status also has an influence on choices. Married men chose culture pattern one and one-third times as often as chance and training and techniques, and physiological characteristics and personality somewhat more often than chance. They chose self-sublimation much less frequently than chance. Self-sublimation, however, was the most popular choice of married women. Far fewer of them than chance selected self-control and self-direction, training and techniques, all of which were popular with married men. Married men showed a definite pattern in choosing characteristics that were not in the group of self-patterns; married women showed a definite pattern in choosing self-sublimation in preference to other qualities; single people showed a preponderance of choices for self-control and self-direction (not chosen by married people) and agreed in part with married men and in part with married women.

People in different sized communities showed differences of attitude on the most important characteristics of a teacher. Those in communities of over 100,000 population chose self-sublimation about one-sixth more often than chance and physiological characteristics and personality about half as often. Those in communities of 1,000 to 10,000 were opposite in their choices. People in communities of 10,000 to 100,000 chose self-control and self-direction and culture pattern less than half as often as chance, and training and techniques one-fifth more often. Training and techniques were least popular among people in the 1,000 to 10,000 communities. The greatest deviations from chance frequency were made by the people in the 10,000 to 100,000 and the 1,000 to 10,000 groups; the first omitted self-control and self-direction and culture pattern much more often, and the second chose physiological characteristics and personality much more often than chance distribution would have expected.

Table 2 shows a gradual dispersion of choices from first to third. Apparently the people became less certain of their ideas as they left first choice and tried to think of a second and then a third.

Salaries

For the sake of brevity, the responses to question 25 are referred to by the term "adequacy"; this use also avoids confusion with question 26, which asked for a response of a definite amount of money

Table 3 shows the distribution of responses to question 25.

TABLE 3
ADEQUACY OF TEACHERS' PAY

Response	Number	Per Cent
1. Too much	2	.4
2. About right	95	18.4
3. Too little	312	60.6
4. Don't know	97	18.8
5. Reject	9	1.7
Total	515	99.9

The majority opinion may appear encouraging to people who have been making efforts to increase teachers' salaries. This statement of attitude by the people, however, must be taken with some degree of caution. Decrying the low state of teachers' salaries has long been a favorite pastime; many people would merely be repeating what they had often heard if they responded that teachers' pay is too little.

The probability values in column 25 of Table 1 show that people within the socio-economic groups classed by age, income, marital status, and educational experience have statistically significant differences of attitude on the adequacy of teachers' pay.

People in the age group of 21-29 show a third less frequency to choose the "About right" response and a third more frequency to choose the "Don't know" response than chance. People from 30 to 39 choose "About right" a third less often and "Too little" a tenth more often than chance. Those from 40 to 49 are nearly normal in the distribution of their responses. Those from 50 to 59 are slightly above normal in both the "About right" and "Too little" responses and a third less than expected in the "Don't know" response. Those from 60 to 69 gave the "About right" response one and three-fourths as often as chance; those above 70, more than twice as often as chance. The two chief characteristics of the distrib-

ution are that people below age 30 do not know what to say about the adequacy of teachers' pay and those above age 60 are preponderantly of the opinion that it is about right now.

Income groups show definite characteristics. Those whose incomes are below $2,000 show about one and two-thirds as great a frequency to choose the "About right" response as chance would indicate. They also show some tendency to choose the "Don't know" response. In the $2,000 to $3,000 group there is a slight tendency below normal to choose the "About right" and the "Too little" responses and a noticeable tendency above normal to give the "Don't know" response. This frequency of "Don't know's" appears again in the over $5,000 group. Those whose incomes are over $3,000 are 10 per cent above normal frequency in their choice of the "Too little" response. The principal characteristic of the distribution of responses by income groups is that those below $2,000 think teachers' pay is about right; those above $3,000 that it is too little; and those between that they don't know.

Perhaps the people are reflecting their idea of the worth of the school. Several investigations give information about students who leave school before graduation that may have some relationship here. In 1938, making a study in the state of New York, Eckert and Marshall found a relationship between withdrawal from school and economic standing:

> The typical boy or girl who withdraws from school before graduation comes from a family of low socio-economic standing. Clear evidence of the selective character of secondary education today is found in the steady increase, from grade to grade, in financial and cultural status. Illustrative of this trend is the fact that some 65 per cent of those pupils who left before finishing the ninth grade came from homes classified by the school as "poor" or "indigent," while less than 20 per cent of the graduates came from such homes. . . . A marked correlation exists between the privilege and opportunity, with the result that the economic disadvantage of withdrawing pupils is intensified by notably ineffective school preparation. All these forces operate to maintain in the next generation the economic hierarchy established in the preceding one.[4]

[4] Ruth E. Eckert and Thomas O. Marshall, *When Youth Leave School* (New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1939), p. 179.

The low income people who would pay teachers low salaries are likely those who withdrew early from school. The combination of their inadequate, perhaps unfortunate, experience with the school and their present low ability to pay for school operation possibly produces their response that teachers are paid about right.

Distribution by marital status shows some marked deviations from chance frequency. Married men did not choose the "About right" response so often as expected; single men chose it one and one-half times as often as expected. The deviations that make the distribution by marital status significant are the large number of single people who chose the "About right" response.

To any one who is interested in raising teachers' pay scales, the single members of society offer a challenge for enlightenment. Married people appear to offer the best alliances.

Three strong deviations from chance frequency appeared in the distribution by educational experience. People who claimed some college attendance were a third less frequent than expected in giving the "Don't know" response; those of high school attendance, a fourth less frequent in the "About right" response; those of elementary school experience, one and one-half times as frequent in the "About right" response. Those of elementary school attendance were a fifth less frequent than chance in giving the "Too little" response and a tenth more than chance in the "Don't know" response. Any public relations program for the purpose of increasing teachers' salaries should be directed at people who have only elementary school experience.

Numbers of people in the groups over age 60, with incomes under $2,000, single of both sexes, and who did not go beyond elementary school were considerably greater than chance in saying that teachers' salaries are about right. Other people apparently fell into the pattern shown by the figures in Table 3.

Table 4 shows the distribution of responses to question 26. Fifty-four per cent of the people favor salaries between $3,000 and $4,500. The median of the figures chosen by the respondents is $3,720.

TABLE 4
AMOUNT OF TEACHER'S SALARIES

Salary	Number	Per cent
$500—999	1	.19
$1,000—1,499	2	.39
$1,500—1,999	4	.78
$2,000—2,499	47	9.13
$2,500—2,999	38	7.38
$3,000—3,499	110	21.36
$3,500—3,999	97	18.83
$4,000—4,499	73	14.17
$4,500—4,999	17	3.30
$5,000—5,499	26	5.05
Don't know	84	16.31
Reject	16	3.11
Total	515	100.00

The 12,937 teachers in the state during the school year of 1948-1949 received a median salary of $3,227,[5] nearly $500 below the figure suggested by the people. The median salary paid 3,480 teachers in the three largest school districts was $3,667, still $50 below the median of the figures chosen by the people. During the school year of 1949-1950, 13,907 teachers in the state received a median salary of $3,279,[6] or $440 below the figure suggested by the people a year previously. The salaries of 3,536 teachers in the three largest districts were increased to a median of $3,740, only $20 above the figure suggested by the people the year before. The median of salaries paid in the smaller districts ranged down to $2,907 for rural teachers in 1948-1949 and $2,961 in 1949-1950.

The probability values in column 26 of Table 1 show that people within the socio-economic groups classed by age, income, marital status, educational experience, and occupation have statistically significant differences of attitude on the amount of teachers' salaries.

[5] Arthur L. Marsh, "School Salaries in Washington, 1948-1949," *Washington Education Journal,* XXVIII (March, 1949), 13 ff.

[6] Arthur L. Marsh, "Compare Your Salary," *Washington Education Journal,* XXIX (March, 1950), 12 ff.

Classification of the responses by the age of the respondents showed that two and one-third times as many people over age 60 as would have been expected by chance distribution favored salaries under $2,500. People between the ages of 50 and 59 showed an excess over chance in selecting the salary range from $2,500 to $3,500. People between 30 and 39 chose $3,500 to $4,500 one and one-fourth times and $4,500 to $5,500 one and one-half times as often as chance frequency. People from 21 to 29 chose $4,500 to $5,500 one and two-fifths times as often as chance. When presented with question 25, people over age 60 showed a preponderance of responses that the pay was about right. But when asked to name an amount, they showed a preponderance to mention a figure markedly below salaries actually being paid. A large number of people under age 30 did not know what to say about the adequacy of teachers' pay, but when asked to name a figure, they put the salaries markedly above their actual figure.

Classification of the responses by the income of the respondents showed that in general people would pay teachers about the same or slightly higher salaries than they themselves receive. Those whose incomes were under $2,000 would pay teachers under $2,500 by more than twice chance frequencies. Those in the $2,000 to $3,000 group would pay between $2,500 and $3,500 by one and two-fifths times chance frequencies. Those in the group of $3,000 to $4,000 showed some preference for the $2,500 to $3,500 salary for teachers. Those who have incomes over $4,000 chose both the $3,500 to $4,500 and the $4,500 to $5,500 salary brackets by one and one-third times chance frequency.

Marital status showed marked deviations from chance frequencies. Married men chose the $3,500 to $4,500 salary bracket one and one-fourth times as often as chance. Married women chose the $4,500 to $5,500 bracket one and one-sixth times and the "Don't know" response one and one-fifth times as often as chance. Single people chose the $1,500 to $2,500 bracket more than one and one-third times and the "Don't know" response one and one-fourth times as often as chance. Married men appear to take a more realistic view of teachers' salaries than do married women or single people. But as observed before, single people offer a challenge to those who would raise teachers' salaries.

Classification of the responses by the educational experience of the respondents showed that those who had attended college chose the lower salary brackets in much fewer than expected frequencies. They chose the $3,500 to $4,500 bracket one and one-fifth and the $4,500 to $5,500 bracket nearly one and one-half times as often as chance. Those who had attended high school did not vary much from chance. Those who had only elementary school attendance chose the $1,500 to $2,500 bracket more than one and one-half times and the "Don't know" response one and one-third times as often as chance.

Perhaps the responses result from educational experience. Those who have attended college are likely to have a tangible idea of the expense involved in preparing for the teaching profession. They also were more interested in the educational process than the general run of the populace, and their experience tended to enforce that interest and make them realize the necessity of paying good salaries to get good teachers. They had success in the school situation; people who dropped out of school had little reason or opportunity to appreciate the services of the school and of teachers and now have little desire to pay teachers good salaries.

A study of the income reported by people of the various levels of educational experience shows that there is a high correlation between education and income. The observed frequencies differed from chance by the very highly significant confidence level of one-tenth of 1 per cent. For example, people who reported more than four years of college appeared in the income group above $4,000 more than twice as often as chance would indicate; people reporting school attendance to the eighth grade or less appeared in the income group above $4,000 less than half as often as chance. People reporting four years of high school appeared above $4,000 a third more often than chance; those reporting one to three years of high school attendance appeared above $4,000 a third less often than chance.

This relationship seems to correlate with attitude on amount of teachers' salaries. Those of less education and smaller incomes favor smaller salaries, and those of more education and higher incomes favor higher salaries.

People interested in maintaining good salary schedules for teachers should find help among those who attended college, cooperation from those who had high school experience, and a large field of

education on such values as are truly present in the modern educational program among those who had only elementary school experience.

The occupations reported by the respondents were grouped as follows: Group 1: professional and semi-professional, farmers and farm managers, proprietors, managers, and officials; Group 2: clerical, sales and kindred workers, craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers, operatives and kindred workers; Group 3: domestic service workers, service workers, farm laborers and foremen, laborers (except farm), and occupation not reported.

Classification of the responses on the amount of teachers' salaries by the three occupational groups showed differences of attitude. Those in Group 1 were one and three-fourths as frequent in their choice of the salary bracket of $4,500 to $5,500 as chance. Those in Group 2 were one and one-third as frequent in the choice of the $1,500 to $2,500 bracket and one and one-fifth as frequent in the choice of the $3,500 to $4,500 bracket as chance. Those in Group 3 were more than one and one-third as frequent in the choice of the $2,500 to $3,500 bracket and one and two-fifths as frequent in the "Don't know" response as chance.

Personal Practices

Table 5 shows that about a third of the people object to smoking or engaging in political activity on the part of their women teachers. Nearly half of them object to moderate drinking, but only one in fifteen objects to dancing. Scarcely more than one in a hundred could

TABLE 5
CERTAIN PERSONAL PRACTICES: WOMEN

Response	Smoked		Drank		Danced		Political activity	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	334	64.8	257	49.9	465	90.2	306	59.4
No	167	32.4	246	47.7	36	6.9	178	34.5
Don't know	7	1.3	5	.9	7	1.3	24	4.6
Reject	7	1.3	7	1.3	7	1.3	7	1.3
Total	515	99.8	515	99.8	515	99.7	515	99.8

not make up his mind on the smoking, drinking or dancing; but one in twenty gave the "Don't know" response on political activity.

The probability values in column 27 of Table 1 show that people within the socio-economic groups classed by age, size of the community in which they live, income, and educational experience have statistically significant differences of attitude on the four personal practices of women teachers.

People from age 21 to 39 would permit moderate smoking and drinking by one and one-fifth to one and one-fourth times as often as chance. Those from age 30 to 39 gave the "Don't know" response one and one-half times as often as chance. Those from age 40 to 49 gave the "Don't know" response only about half as often as chance and the "Yes" response to the four parts of the question slightly more often than chance. Those from age 50 to 59 would permit moderate smoking and drinking only about four-fifths as often as chance and gave the "No" response one and one-fourth times as often as chance. Those over age 60 would permit moderate smoking and drinking only about two-thirds and three-fifths respectively as often as chance. They gave the "No" response one and two-fifths as often as chance. In general, people under age 40 would allow the four practices; those over age 50 would not allow them.

People in communities of over 100,000 population showed slightly greater frequency than chance in allowing the practices, especially moderate drinking the "Yes" responses to which were 15 per cent above chance frequency. People in communities of 10,000 to 100,000 population also gave "Yes" response more often than chance; on moderate smoking, 14 per cent; on engaging in political activity, 15 per cent more often than chance. They gave the "Don't know" response only a fifth as often as chance. People in communities of 1,000 to 10,000 population were somewhat less frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response except for engaging in political activity, where they exceeded chance by 15 per cent. They did not give the "Don't know" response at all. People in communities under 1,000 population gave the "Don't know" response one and two-thirds as often as chance and the "No" response 17 per cent more often than chance. They gave the "Yes" response to moderate smoking, moderate drinking, and engaging in political activity about one-seventh less often than chance. In other words, people in commun-

ities of over 10,000 would be prone to allow the four practices; those in communities of 1,000 to 10,000, not to allow them except for political activity; and those in smaller communities not to allow any of the four.

Those whose incomes were under $1,000 would allow moderate smoking only four-fifths as often as chance, gave the "No" response one and one-fifth as often as chance, and the "Don't know" response one and seven-tenths as often as chance. Those whose incomes were between $1,000 and $2,000 gave the "No" response one and one-half times as often as chance and the "Yes" response correspondingly less often. Those whose incomes were between $2,000 and $3,000 would allow moderate smoking and drinking slightly more often and dancing and engaging in political activity slightly less often than chance. They were also one and one-third times as frequent as chance in giving the "Don't know" response. Those from $3,000 to $4,000 were slightly less frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response to moderate smoking and drinking and more frequent to dancing and engaging in political activity, especially the latter which was 11 per cent above chance. Those over $4,000 were somewhat more frequent in moderate smoking and drinking, especially the latter which was 27.5 per cent above chance. They were 18 per cent less frequent to give the "No" response and 39 per cent less frequent to give the "Don't know" response. In the response to engaging in political activity they contrasted with the $3,000 to $4,000 group. The people above $4,000 income would allow political activity 5 per cent less often and the $3,000 to $4,000 group 11 per cent more often than chance.

Since it has been pointed out that the length of educational experience correlates with income, it is not surprising to find that classification by education also shows a pattern of responses on the four personal practices. People who had attended college were somewhat more frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response, especially to moderate drinking, where they exceeded chance by 21 per cent. They gave the "Don't know" response only two-thirds as often as chance. People who had attended high school were slightly more frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response except on political activity. People who had attended only elementary school gave the "Yes" response on moderate smoking and drinking only two-thirds as often as chance and on dancing and engaging

in political activity somewhat less often than chance. They gave the "No" response 39 per cent more often and the "Don't know" response 16 per cent more often than chance.

A general view of the responses of the people on the four practices as applied to women teachers shows a rather liberal attitude toward teachers.

TABLE 6
CERTAIN PERSONAL PRACTICES: MEN

Response	Smoked		Drank		Danced		Political activity	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	449	87.	309	60.2	473	91.8	329	63.7
No	57	11.3	193	37.5	31	6.	164	31.6
Don't know	3	.6	7	1.4	5	1.	16	3.1
Reject	6	1.2	6	1.2	6	1.2	6	1.2
Total	515	100.1	515	100.3	515	100.0	515	99.6

A comparison of Table 6 with Table 5 shows that only about one-third as many people object to smoking on the part of their men teachers as do on the part of women. Ten per cent fewer object to moderate drinking by men than do by women. The difference on the question of dancing is very small. The difference on the question of engaging in political activity is also small; for the most part those who object to political activity for women also object for men. Only two-thirds as many give the response of "Don't know" on the question of political activity for men as do for women.

The comparison of the two tables indicates that on the question of moderate smoking and drinking the double standard still holds for a number of people; many people are more liberal in allowing those personal practices to men than to women.

The probability values in column 28 of Table 1 show that people within the socio-economic groups classed by community size, educational experience, and occupation have statistically significant differences of attitude on the four personal practices of men teachers.

People in communities of over 100,000 population appear in slightly more than chance frequencies in allowing the four practices, especially moderate drinking, where they show 13 per cent more than chance frequency in the "Yes" response. People in commun-

ities of 10,000 to 100,000 population show slightly more than chance frequency on moderate smoking and on dancing. They are slightly less frequent than chance in allowing moderate drinking and 11 per cent more than chance in allowing political activity. They do not give the "Don't know" response. People in communities of 1,000 to 10,000 show less than chance frequency in allowing moderate smoking and dancing and 20 per cent less than chance in allowing moderate drinking. They give the "No" response 29 per cent more frequently than chance and do not give the "Don't know" response. People in communities of less than 1,000 population are slightly less frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response and 12 per cent more frequent in giving the "No" response to all four practices. They give the "Don't know" response 62 per cent more frequently than chance.

In other words, people in communities of over 10,000 are more liberal and those in communities of less than 10,000 are less liberal in allowing the four practices to men than chance distribution would indicate.

The responses of people of the various sized communities on the question of the four practices as applied to both men and women indicate that teachers going into the schools should be aware of what the people of the community expect of them. If they wish to live in rapport with the community, they must be willing to conduct themselves as the residents desire. Teacher training schools would do well to assist the prospective teachers in learning how they must act in order to be accepted by the community and be given the opportunity of participating in community affairs.

Educational experience shows a pattern of response. People who have attended college approve moderate drinking and engaging in political activity 12.5 per cent more often than chance. They approve moderate smoking and dancing somewhat more often than chance. They give the "No" response 30 per cent less often and the "Don't know" response 39 per cent less often than chance. People who have attended high school give the "No" response 11 per cent less often and "Don't know" response 12 per cent more often than chance. People who have attended only elementary school are less frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response, especially on moderate drinking, where they are 24 per cent less than chance. They give the "No" response 46 per cent and the "Don't know"

response 10 per cent more often than chance. People of some college education are quite liberal; those of some high school education, slightly liberal; and those of only elementary education, rather strongly restrictive in their attitudes toward the four practices as applied to men teachers.

The occupations reported by the respondents were classed into three groups as mentioned above. People in Group 1 gave the "Don't know" response 63 per cent and the "No" response 14 per cent less often than chance. They were somewhat more frequent than chance in giving the "Yes" response to political activity, dancing, and especially moderate drinking, where they exceeded chance by 11 per cent. People in Group 2 gave the "Don't know" response 44 per cent and the "No" response 14 per cent less often than chance. They were somewhat more frequent than chance in allowing moderate smoking, moderate drinking, and dancing and exactly the equal of chance in their responses on engaging in political activity. People in Group 3 gave the "Yes" response less often than chance on the four practices, especially moderate drinking, where they were 22 per cent less than chance. They exceeded chance by 33 per cent in the "No" response and 131 per cent in the "Don't know" response. In summary, Group 1 people were markedly liberal; Group 2, somewhat liberal; and Group 3, markedly restrictive.

The large number of socio-economic classifications that did not show statistically significant deviations from chance frequencies would seem to indicate that many people did not consider the question crucial when it referred to men and did not answer on the basis of their background or situation but rather by chance.

TABLE 7

EMPLOYMENT OF MARRIED WOMEN

Response	Number	Per cent
Yes	287	55.7
No	211	40.9
Don't know	9	1.7
Reject	8	1.5
Total	515	99.8

The T test of significance[7] shows that the 55.7 per cent who favor the employing of married women may be accepted as a true majority at the confidence level of one-half of 1 per cent. The 40.9 per cent who are opposed may be accepted as a true minority (less than 50 per cent) at the confidence level of one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Statistical treatment, then, would indicate that at least a majority of the people think married women should be employed as teachers in public schools in normal times. The term "normal times" was defined neither in the schedule nor by the respondents. Since there was probably a larger supply of teachers available in 1948 in proportion to the demand than there had been in the years before or is likely to be within the ten years following, perhaps the respondents considered the current time as normal.

Column 29 in Table 1 gives probability values showing that people classed by educational experience form the only socio-economic group of those here tested that deviated significantly from chance distributions. Those who had attended college gave the "Yes" response 26 per cent more often and the "No" response 36 per cent less often than chance. Those who had attended high school gave the "Yes" response 5 per cent less often and the "No" response 7 per cent more often than chance. Those who had attended only elementary school gave the "Yes" response 11 per cent less often and the "No" response 15 per cent more often than chance.

College people are themselves probably more interested in pursuing professional careers than are those of less education. Therefore, they perhaps have more sympathy with the teacher who wishes to continue a professional career in addition to marriage. The additional educational experience may have given the college people insight into values of marriage that may be applied in the teaching situation. At any rate, people who had attended college were much more frequently in favor of employing married women as teachers than those of less education.

---

[7] Calculated by the formula $T = \frac{s - h}{\sigma_s}$ where s is the observed value, h is the hypothetical value (in this case 50%) and σ_s is the standard error of the observed value. Peatman, p. 372. The T test is used here to determine the degree of probability with which one may assume that the observed 55.7% is a true majority and not a fluctuation resulting merely from chance.

The fact that only one of the eleven socio-economic groupings deviated significantly from chance would seem to show that people did not consider the question sufficiently significant to allow their answers to be influenced by those parts of their background that were considered in this study.

Summary

The study analyzes the expressions of attitudes of the people of the State of Washington on characteristics, salaries, and personal practices of public school teachers. Statistical treatment showed that twenty of the eighty-five relationships between attitudes and certain socio-economic factors of the respondents' backgrounds were distributed in significantly different numbers.

In mentioning the most important characteristics of a teacher, a majority of people chose personal qualities that are not necessarily related to the training in methods, techniques, and subject matter as usually given in teacher training courses. People living in different sized communities, of different incomes, and of different marital status showed statistically significant differences of attitudes.

A majority of the people expressed the attitude that teachers were paid too little. The rest of the people were about evenly divided between saying that they did not know and that teachers were paid about right. People of different ages, different incomes, different marital status, and different educational experience expressed attitudes that were of statistically significant difference.

When asked to state the salary that should be paid a good teacher of ten years' experience, people mentioned figures whose median was $500 greater than the median of salaries then being paid teachers in the state. People of different ages, incomes, marital status, educational experience, and occupation expressed attitudes that were of statistically significant difference.

A majority of the people indicated that they would employ as a teacher a woman who smoked moderately, went to dances, and engaged in political activity. Fifty per cent said that they would and 48 per cent said that they would not employ a woman who drank moderately. People of different ages, community sizes, incomes, and educational experience expressed attitudes that were of statistically significant difference.

A majority of the people indicated they would employ as a teacher a man who smoked moderately, drank moderately, went to dances, and engaged in political activity. In each of the four parts of the question the percentage of people who would allow the practice was larger for men than for women, showing a tendency toward a double standard. People of different community sizes, educational experience, and occupation expressed attitudes that were of statistically significant difference.

A majority of the people indicated that they would employ a married woman as a teacher. People of different educational experience expressed attitudes that were of statistically significant difference.

In general, the people were quite liberal minded in their responses to the questions considered in this study. The differences of opinion that apparently resulted from differences in background point the way to further study of the attitudes of the people toward their public schools and of ways in which the schools can better serve their communities.

PRICE LIST OF SEPARATE NUMBERS
RESEARCH STUDIES of the STATE COLLEGE OF WASHINGTON

Vols. I-X. See pp. 225-29 of Vol. XVIII, No. 4.

Vol. XI (1943), No. 1. The Social Functions of War, *Elon H. Moore.* The Impact of War on Population, *Constantine Panunzio.* Factors Conditioning Productivity and Morale of Wartime Shipyard Workers, *Joseph Cohen.* Familial Problems and the Japanese Removal, *Leonard Bloom.* A Study of the Social Unadjustment Problems of a Selected Group of Junior College Girls, *Pearl E. Clark.* The Integration of Foreign Groups, *Marianne W. Beth.* The Role of News in the Creation of a Post-War World Community, *Carl F. Reuss.* Divorce in Oregon, *William C. Smith.* The Changing Age Structure in the Population of Cities, *Frederick A. Conrad.* Intensive Non-Directive Interviewing as a Method in Social Research, *Joel V. Berreman.* Experimental Criminology, *C. W. Topping.* Financial Statement of Pacific Sociological Society. 48 pp. Price.....$0.50

No. 2. The Genus *Atanycolus* Foerster in America North of Mexico, *Roy D. Shenefelt.* Effects of Lime on the Reaction, Base Saturation, and Availability of Plant Nutrients in Certain Western Washington Soils, *Laraine E. Dunn.* 120 pp. Price $1.00

No. 3. George Turner, Attorney-at-Law, *Claudius O. Johnson.* The Narrative Structure of Browning's *The Ring and the Book, B. R. McElderry, Jr. The Plain Dealer* in the Eighteenth Century, *Emmett L. Avery.* Lessing's Intention in *Der Dorfjunker, Paul P. Kies.* 96 pp. Price.....$0.90

No. 4. Some Repercussions of the New Orleans Mafia Incident of 1891, *J. Alexander Karlin.* France and the Balkan Crisis of 1885-86, *Winston B. Thorson.* 40 pp. Price $0.50

Vol. XII (1944), No. 1. Human Relations in Forestry, *Glen E. Carlson.* Retributive Justice as a Check to Future Wars, *Richard T. LaPiere.* Rural Reactions to War Measures, *E. D. Tetreau.* Assimilation of Wartime Migrants into Community Life, *Carl F. Reuss.* Prisonization and the WRA Camps, *Leonard Bloom.* Religious Cooperation in Wartime, *Philip M. Smith.* Official Reports, *Pacific Sociological Society.* 48 pp. $0.60.

No. 2. The Botanical Collections of Wilhelm N. Sukdorf, 1850-1932, *William A. Weber.* The Theme of Desertion in Wordsworth, *Karl G. Pfeiffer.* 80 pp. $0.90.

No. 3. The Reputation of Wycherley's Comedies as Stage Plays in the Eighteenth Century, *Emmett L. Avery.* Joseph Conrad's Critical Views, *Walter F. Wright.* The Rise of the Wisconsin Timber Baronies, *John L. Harr.* 64 pp. $0.70.

No. 4. A Revision of the Genus *Gaillardia, Susann Fry Biddulph.* Charles de Freycinet, French Empire Builder, *Winston B. Thorson.* 80 pp. $0.90.

Vol. XIII (1945), No. 1. Sociologists, What Now? *William C. Smith.* Pre-War and Wartime Migration to Seattle, *Calvin F. Schmid.* Too Many Workers—A Post-War Labor Problem, *Walter C. McKain, Jr.* Sociologists and the Army Language and Area Studies, *Ray E. Baber.* Problems of the Veteran Returning to a Subsistence-Farm Area, *Charles E. Hutchinson.* How Can Sociology Contribute to the Socialization of Attitudes and of Personality in the Post-War World? *Bessie Averne McClenahan.* Official Reports of the Pacific Sociological Society. 48 pp. Price $0.75

No. 2. Blueprint of the Nazi Underground—Past and Future Subversive Activities, *Robert M. W. Kempner.* The Authorship of *The Fatal Extravagance, Paul P. Kies.* 112 pp. Price.....$1.00

No. 3. Milton's Prelapsarian Adam, *Murray W. Bundy.* The Ethical Ideas of Timothy Dwight, *Lewis E. Buchanan.* 40 pp. Price.....$0.50

No. 4. Conrad's *The Rescue* from Serial to Book, *Walter F. Wright.* A Tentative Calendar of Daily Theatrical Performances, 1660-1700, *Emmett L. Avery.* 88 pp. Price .....$1.00.

Vol. XIV (1946), No. 1. Inquisition Papers of Mexico, I, *J. Horace Nunemaker.* A Note on the Authorship of *The Fatal Extravagance, Paul P. Kies.* Curry County, Oregon: The Geography of an Isolated Coast, *Willis B. Merriam.* 96 pp. Price.....$1.00.

No. 2. Present Trends in Race Relations, *Ray E. Baber.* An Outline of Japanese War Propaganda to Occupied Areas, *Joel V. Berreman.* Evacuation of Japanese from the Pacific Coast: Canadian and American Contrasts, *Robert W. O'Brien.* The Rural Rehabilitation Program as an Instrument of Social Change, *Olaf F. Larson.* Wartime Trends in the Population of the State of Washington, *Calvin F. Schmid.* Crime and Punishment among Minority Groups in Los Angeles County, *Edwin M. Lemert, Judy Roseberg.* Housing Problems of Minority Groups in Los Angeles County, *Charles B. Spaulding.* Racial Tensions among Japanese in the Intermountain Northwest, *Tolbert H. Kennedy.* Wartime Rural Migration, Western Speciality Crop Areas, *H. Otto Dahlke.* 64 pp. Price.....$0.80.

No. 3. Racial Survey of the Intermountain Northwest, *Tolbert H. Kennedy.* Notes on Millay's *The King's Henchman, Paul P. Kies.* 88 pp. Price. .....$1.00.

No. 4. The Composition and Early Stage History of *Masks and Faces, Donald H. MacMahon.* Religious Observance of State College of Washington Students, *John B. Edlefsen.* 40 pp. Price.....$0.50.

Vol. XV (1947), No. 1. Inquisition Papers of Mexico: II. The Trial of Luis de la Cruz, 1656, *Josephine Yocum McClaskey.* New Sources for Pope's Eclogues? *Leslie M. Oliver.* 112 pp. Price $1.25

No. 2. Some Remarks on Sociological Theory and Sociological Research. *Calvin F. Schmid.* Wartime Private Residential Construction and Residential Land-Use Trends in the Seattle Metropolitan Area, *Joseph Cohen.* Attitudes toward Euthanasia, *Thomas D. Eliot.* Social Characteristics of Taxi-Dancers, *Clyde B. Vedder.* An Integration of the College Marriage Course, *Carlo L. Lastrucci.* A Survey of Some Changes in the Seattle Japanese Community since Evacuation, *S. Frank Miyamoto* and *Robert W. O'Brien.* The Future Development of Industrial Sociology, *Delbert C. Miller.* Field Experiments in Sociology, *Julius A. Jahn.* Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage, *Harvey J. Locke.* Members of the Pacific Sociological Society. 64 pp. Price $0.80

No. 3. Pure Painting, *Worth D. Griffin.* History and Development of School Finance in Washington, *Zeno B. Katterle.* A Probable Borrowing by Coleridge from *The Seasons, Herbert E. Arntson.* 32 pp. Price $0.50

No. 4. The Genus *Allium* in Arizona, *Marion Ownbey.* The American Press and the Rhineland Crisis of 1936, *Winston B. Thorson.* A Scientific Inaccuracy in Some Recent Plays, *Paul P. Kies.* 56 pp. Price.....$0.75

Vol. XVI (1948), No. 1. Sociology in the Perspective of a Quarter-Century, *Richard T. LaPiere.* Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage, *C. W. Topping.* An Appraisal of Some Methodological Aspects of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, Paul Wallin.* Some Aspects of a General Theory of Sociopathic Behavior, *Edwin M. Lemert.* Prediction of Marital Adjustment of Divorced Persons in Subsequent Marriages, *Harvey J. Locke* and *William J. Klausner.* Problems in Public Polling, *J. E. Bachelder.* A Factual Study of Certain Washington School Children in Relation to Commercial Motion Pictures, *T. H. Kennedy.* New Patterns in Old Mexico, *Norman S. Hayner.* Self-Appraisal by Rural and Urban Youth of Their Preparedness for Adult Roles, *L. J. Elias.* Professors in Retirement, *Elon H. Moore.* Members of the Pacific Sociological Society. 64 pp. Price.....$1.00

No. 2. The Chronology of Wyclif's English Sermons, *Margaret Wallace Ransom.* The Historical Geography of the Rogue River Valley, Oregon, *Willis B. Merriam.* 56 pp. Price.....$0.75

Nos. 3-4. The Farmers' Alliance in Washington, *Fred R. Yoder.* Lowell and the Two Doras, *Paul P. Kies.* 68 pp. $1.25